## **DESIGN REVIEW BOARD - MINUTES**

CITY CONFERENCE ROOM 107 February 9, 2006: 4:00 P.M.

1A. Roll Call.

Members present: Bostater, Hamman, Hinnenkamp, Millikin, Perney and Renz

Members absent: Lynch

Department staff: John Burger & Gayle Martin

1B. Introduction of Guests.

None.

1C. Additions or corrections to the agenda.

2. Old Business:

None

3. New Business:

3A. Review of Application #CC06-2, filed by Salina Regional Health Center, 400 S. Santa Fe Avenue, requesting the approval of a certificate of compatibility to allow the demolition of five residential structures and three accessory structures located on property legally described as the West 175 feet of Lot 1 & Lots 7, 9, & 10, Block 2, Replat of Beebe's 2<sup>nd</sup> Addition to the City of Salina, Saline County, Kansas and addressed as 517 S. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, 206 Center; 201, 211 & 215 E. Prescott Avenue.

(Mr. Hamman and Mr. Bostater joined the meeting at this point.)

Mr. Burger presented the staff report as contained in the case file.

Mrs. Perney asked does the applicant wish to add any comments?

Jack Hinnenkamp, representing Salina Regional Health Center, stated I might add to John's good report that we do have one of those houses still occupied, 517 S. 5<sup>th</sup>. They had already when we purchased the property intended to move as they were having another house built. It is simply that they had some delays that they did not anticipate. So they are expected to out by the end of the month, by the beginning of March. If approved we wouldn't obviously start any demolition process on this house until they were out. They were planning to move before we purchased the property. Of course, this application is simply a continuation of the application that you heard last July and for the agreed upon future land use of these properties. This proposal is to remove five additional residences from this block. We don't see this as anything new here just a continuation of what has been approved in the past and the functions to meet what we have been approved for in the past. The near term use for the property is for construction material, storage and

staging. In the long term this may need to be maintained for parking for the Salina Regional Health Center; to work through that process of development. That is two to three years down the road. In addition to that we have two or three other potential projects under consideration down the road. We have to determine whether this is the best location for them. I think with these short statements that we would be grateful for your approval that being Option 1 or Option 2. I don't thing that we would take any exception to staff's recommendations of leaving the healthy mature trees that do not need to be removed as part of the demolition until future functions could be determined. Sidewalks would be repaired if broken. I would say that this block already had a considerable amount of damage to sidewalks, curbs and driveways. Naturally, we would put things right that can be put right related to that. Then whatever shielding that would be required by City Ordinance. The contractor is working with the City Planning and Building Inspection Departments to determine what the requirements would be there for screening remaining residences. At this point in time that has been communicated to them. Any additional development on the property would be subject to additional review by this Board. With that we would respectfully ask for favorable consideration of this request. Would you have any additional questions regarding the project?

Mr. Hamman asked you've got gas lines in there. Do you go all the way back down to the primary gas line to shut them off or do you cap them where they are at a little below grade?

Mr. Hinnenkamp stated we do what is required for us by the City. Normally when we are working with KPL we take them out to the street; the same way with plumbing with the water service lines. Unless we have a defined use, those services have to go back and be capped off. Especially things like sewer, you terminate them near their point of origin. That is what we did here previously and over there at 446, 448 and 450 S. 7<sup>th</sup> Street. That was how all those were handled.

Mrs. Perney asked John, for voting purposes did you mark Bob Hamman and Mike Bostater as joining us prior to hearing this application?

Mr. Burger stated that he correcedt the attendance role and included them.

Mrs. Perney stated if there are no further questions, do I hear a motion?

MOTION: I would move that we approve the demolition of these structures based upon

Option 2 with the four recommended conditions provided by City staff.

SECOND: Mr. Millikin seconded the motion.

VOTE: Motion approved 5-0, I abstention (Hinnenkamp).

Design Review Board Minutes February 9, 2006 Page 3

## 4. Other Matters.

Mr. Burger stated that we are completing some of the last meeting minutes from the 2005 meetings of the Design Review Board. We appreciate your being patient with receiving them.

## 5. The next meeting, if scheduled, will be on February 23, 2006.

Mr. Burger stated that no applications are pending for the February 23, 2006 meeting so that meeting will not be held. The next regular meeting after that will be on March 14, 2006.

## 6. A motion to adjourn is in order.

Mrs. Lynch moved to adjourn the meeting.

There being no other matters the meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

John Burger, Assistant Secretary

Attest: